arXiv:1506.07193v1 [math.SP] 23 Jun 2015

EIGENVALUE BOUNDS FOR DIRAC AND FRACTIONAL SCHRÖDINGER OPERATORS WITH COMPLEX POTENTIALS

Abstract. We prove Lieb-Thirring-type bounds for fractional Schrödinger operators and Dirac operators with complex-valued potentials. The main new ingredient is a resolvent bound in Schatten spaces for the unperturbed operator, in the spirit of Frank and Sabin.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Main results 2
3. Uniform $L^p \to L^{p'}$ resolvent estimates 4
4. Uniform resolvent estimates in Schatten spaces 7
5. Proof of Theorem 2.3 11
6. Further results 13
6.1. Bounds on individual eigenvalues 13
6.2. Weighted eigenvalue sums 14
Appendix A. Conclusion of the proof of Lemma 4.3 17
References 18

1. Introduction

Many recent publications have dealt with eigenvalue bounds for non-selfadjoint perturbations of classical operators from mathematical physics, for example [1, 9, 14, 2, 16, 8, 3, 4, 17, 6, 5, 10]. One of the more common approaches, initiated in [2], is to regard the eigenvalues as zeros of a holomorphic function (a regularized determinant) and then use function-theoretic arguments related to Jensen's identity to estimate sums of eigenvalues. Taking the Schrödinger operator $-\Delta + V$ as an example, eigenvalues could a priori accumulate at any point in $[0, \infty)$. A typical result of [10] is that for any sequence $\{z_j\}_j$ of eigenvalues accumulating to a point $\lambda \neq 0$ satisfies [1] that $\{\mathrm{dist}(z_j, [0, \infty))\}_j \in l^1$, provided $V \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $d/2 < q \leq (d+1)/2$. This is an improvement of earlier results of [3, 4] where it was shown that such a sequence is in $l^{q+\epsilon}$ for some $q > d/2$. Additionally, the latter estimates require a lower bound on the real part of V or an estimate of the numerical range of $-\Delta + V$. In this paper we prove that $\{\mathrm{dist}(z_j, [0, \infty))\}_j \in l^1$ for eigenvalues of $H_0 + V$ where H_0 is either a fractional Laplacian or a Dirac operator. This restriction is somewhat arbitrary, but we found that particular choice to be a reasonable generalization of the results of [10, Sect. 4 and 6]. With this in mind, we have made an effort to state the key estimates, Lemma 3.3 and especially Lemma 4.3, in greater generality than needed. The techniques for proving these estimates are standard in harmonic analysis (complex interpolation, stationary phase), and the proof bears close resemblance to the proof of the Stein-Tomas restriction theorem. The two lemmas are used to prove Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 4.1. The first is an analogue of the uniform Sobolev inequality due to Kenig, Ruiz and Sogge [13, Thm. 2.3] that states that for $d \geq 3$, $2d/(d+2) \leq p \leq 2(d+1)/(d+3)$ and all $z \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|z| = 1$,

---

[1] The point $\lambda^* = 0$ is special since it is a critical value of $\xi \mapsto |\xi|^2$.

$$\|(-\Delta - z)^{-1}\|_{L^p \to L^{p'}} \leq C, \tag{1.1}$$

where the constant is independent of z. The second[2] is an analogue of the closely related uniform resolvent estimate in Schatten spaces of Frank and Sabin [10, Thm. 12]: For $d \geq 3$, $d/2 \leq q \leq (d+1)/2$ and $|z| = 1$,

$$\|W_1(-\Delta - z)^{-1}W_2\|_{\mathfrak{S}^{q(d-1)/(d-q)}} \leq C\|W_1\|_{L^{2q}}\|W_2\|_{L^{2q}}. \tag{1.2}$$

The bound (1.2) implies (1.1) by a duality argument since $\mathfrak{S}^\alpha \subset \mathfrak{S}^\infty = \mathcal{B}(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$. At the same time, the proof of (1.2) relies on the kernel bounds of [13] for complex powers of the resolvent. These bounds were obtained by using an explicit formula for the Fourier transform of the symbol. In our case, no explicit formulas are available, and the proof has to be more flexible. Although the method is essentially known, our resolvent estimates seem to be new.

2. Main results

Assumption 2.1. The unperturbed Hamiltonian is $H_0 = T(D)$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where $T(D)$ is one of the following kinetic energies[3].

- $T(D) = (-\Delta)^{s/2}$,
- $T(D) = (1-\Delta)^{s/2} - 1$,
- $T(D) = \sum_{j=1}^d \alpha_j(-\mathrm{i}\nabla_j)$,
- $T(D) = \sum_{j=1}^d \alpha_j(-\mathrm{i}\nabla_j) + \beta$.

We denote by $\Lambda_c(H_0)$ the set of critical values of $T(\cdot)$. For the Dirac operators $\mathcal{D}_0$ and $\mathcal{D}_1$ we consider the the symbol corresponding to their eigenvalues, $\lambda_\pm(\xi) = \pm|\xi|$ and $\lambda_\pm(\xi) = \pm(1+|\xi|^2)^{1/2}$. Hence,

$$\Lambda_c((-\Delta)^{s/2}) = \begin{cases} \{0\} & \text{if } s > 1, \\ \emptyset & \text{if } s \leq 1, \end{cases} \quad \Lambda_c((1-\Delta)^{s/2} - 1) = \{0\},$$

and

$$\Lambda_c(\mathcal{D}_0) = \emptyset, \quad \Lambda_c(\mathcal{D}_1) = \{1, -1\}.$$

We adopt the convention that $s = 1$ when $H_0 = \mathcal{D}_0$ or $H_0 = \mathcal{D}_1$. To limit case-by-case arguments, we will assume that $0 < s < d$. We will use the notation $R_0(z) = (T(D) - z)^{-1}$ for the resolvent.

Assumption 2.2. Let $0 < s < d$ be fixed, and let V be a complex-valued[4] potential. Assume s and V satisfy one of the following assumptions.

---

[2] In fact, both (1.1) and (1.2) hold also in $d = 2$ if one excludes an endpoint. Moreover, the general case $|z| > 0$ is obtained by scaling.

[3] Here, α_j, $j = 1, \ldots, n$ and $\beta = \alpha_{n+1}$ satisfy the Clifford relations $\alpha_i\alpha_j + \alpha_j\alpha_i = 2\delta_{ij}I_n$, and n is some even number. We will suppress the identity I_n in the following.

[4] In the case where H_0 is a Dirac operator ($\mathcal{D}_0$ or $\mathcal{D}_1$) we allow V to be a (generally non-hermitian) matrix-valued potential.

a) $s \geq 2d/(d+1)$ and $V \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where $d/s \leq q \leq (d+1)/2$.
b) $s < 2d/(d+1)$ and $V \in L^{d/s}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{(d+1)/2}$.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $H_0 = T(D)$, and let V be a complex-valued potential such that Assumptions 2.1–2.2 hold. If K is a compact subset of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Lambda_c(H_0)$, then*

$$\sum_{z \in \sigma(H_0+V) \cap K} \operatorname{dist}(z, \sigma(H_0)) \leq C(K, V). \tag{2.1}$$

Moreover, there exists $C(K)$ such that if[5] $\|V\| \leq C(K)$*, then* $\sigma(H_0+V) \cap K = \emptyset$.

Remark 2.4. In case a), when $d/s < q \leq (d+1)/2$, there is an "effective" bound in terms of the L^q-norm of V, i.e. the right hand side of (2.1) may be replaced by $C(K, \|V\|_{L^q})$, see Theorem 6.6 in Section 6. There we also prove versions of (2.1) where the sum is taken over all eigenvalues, not only those in K. The price to pay for this generalization is that one has to insert a weight which may become zero at the critical values $\Lambda_c(H_0)$ or at infinity.

The proof of this theorem consists of two parts: An abstract theorem based on a result of [2] in complex analysis and uniform resolvent estimates. The latter will be needed to handle the potentials appearing in the theorem. If the potential V satisfies much stronger assumption (for example, V compactly supported), then the uniform resolvent estimates are much easier. To illustrate this, we give a proof of Theorem 2.3 for the following special case: $H_0 = (-\Delta)^{s/2}$ with $d/2 < s < d$, and $V \in L^{d/s}_{\mathrm{comp}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Proof of Theorem 2.3 (special case). We claim that

$$|R_0(x-y;z)| \leq C(R)|x-y|^{s-d}, \quad |x-y| \leq R, \tag{2.2}$$

holds for a constant independent of $z \in \rho(H_0)$. By homogeneity, it suffices to prove (2.2) for $|z| = 1$. Let χ be a radial bump function supported in $\{1/2 \leq |\xi| \leq 3/2\}$. Then the estimate (2.2) holds for $(1-\chi(D))R_0(z)$ by standard estimates, see e.g. [19, Prop. VI.4.1]. For $\chi(D)R_0(z)$ we get an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ kernel bound by comparison with the Hilbert transform (see (3.11)). Assume that $\operatorname{supp}(V) \subset B(0, R/2)$. Then it follows from (2.2) and the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality (recall $d/s < s < d$) that

$$\||V|^{1/2} R_0(z) V^{1/2}\|_{\mathfrak{S}^2}^2 \leq C(R)^2 \int\int \frac{|V(x)||V(y)|}{|x-y|^{2(s-d)}} \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}y \leq C\|V\|_{L^{d/s}}^2. \tag{2.3}$$

The second claim of the theorem follows by a straightforward application of the Birman-Schwinger principle: Suppose $z \in \rho(H_0)$ is an eigenvalue of $H_0 + V$. Then there exists $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $-Vf = (H_0 - z)f$. Applying $R_0(z)$ to both sides, multiplying by $|V|^{1/2}$, and then setting $|V|^{1/2} f = g$, we obtain

$$-g = |V|^{1/2} R_0(z) V^{1/2} g.$$

Clearly, $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ again, and hence the operator $|V|^{1/2} R_0(z) V^{1/2}$ has an eigenvalue -1. But this means that its norm is at least 1. Since the norm of an operator is bounded from above by its Hilbert-Schmidt norm, (2.3) tells us that $1 \leq C\|V\|_{L^{d/s}}^2$. Therefore, a necessary condition for the existence of an eigenvalue in $\rho(H_0)$ is that $\|V\|_{L^{d/s}}$ is bigger than some positive constant.[6] We turn to the proof of (2.1). By the previous argument (Birman-Schwinger principle) and the theory of infinite determinants (see e.g. [18, Thm. 9.2]) it follows that the eigenvalues of $H_0 + V$ in $\rho(H_0)$ coincide with the zeros of the (regularized) determinant

---

[5] Here, $\|V\|$ denotes the norm of V in the appropriate space, depending on the case a) or b).

[6] The case where the eigenvalue can be embedded in $\sigma(H_0)$ follows from [11, Proposition 3.1].

$$h(z) := \det_2(I + |V|^{1/2} R_0(z) V^{1/2}), \quad z \in \rho(H_0),$$

This is an analytic function, and there is the well-known bound

$$\log|h(z)| \leq C \| |V|^{1/2} R_0(z) V^{1/2} \|_{\mathfrak{S}^2}^2. \tag{2.4}$$

From (2.3) and (2.4) it thus follows that h is bounded. As noted in [10], one can apply a Jensen-type inequality for the upper half-plane $\mathbb{C}^+$ to the map $w \mapsto h(w^2)$, giving

$$\sum_{h(z)=0} \frac{\mathrm{Im}\sqrt{z}}{1+|z|} < \infty.$$

When we restrict z to a compact subset K of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, this sum is comparable to the one in (2.1). □

3. UNIFORM $L^p \to L^{p'}$ RESOLVENT ESTIMATES

Theorem 3.1. *Let $H_0 = T(D)$ where $T(D)$ is one of the operators in Assumption 2.1, and let K be a compact subset of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Lambda_c(H_0)$. Then there exists a constant $C(K)$ such that the following estimates hold.*

a) *If $s \geq 2d/(d+1)$ and $2d/(d+s) \leq p \leq 2(d+1)/(d+3)$, then*

$$\|R_0(z) f\|_{L^{p'}} \leq C(K) \|f\|_{L^p}. \tag{3.1}$$

b) *If $s < 2d/(d+1)$, then*

$$\|R_0(z) f\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-s}} + L^{\frac{2(d+1)}{d-1}}} \leq C(K) \|f\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+s}} \cap L^{\frac{2(d+1)}{d+3}}}. \tag{3.2}$$

Corollary 3.2. *Let V be a complex-valued potential satisfying Assumption 2.2, and let K be a compact subset of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Lambda_c(H_0)$. Then there exists a constant $C(K)$ such that*

$$\left\| |V|^{1/2} R_0(z) V^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \leq C(K, \|V\|), \quad z \in K. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. We prove the case where V satisfies Assumption 2.2b). The proof of case a) is similar and easier still. Denote $X = L^{\frac{2d}{d+s}} \cap L^{\frac{2(d+1)}{d+3}}$ and its dual $X^* = L^{\frac{2d}{d-s}} + L^{\frac{2(d+1)}{d-1}}$. Theorem 3.1 yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle R_0(z) V^{1/2} f, |V|^{1/2} g \rangle| &\leq \|R_0(z) V^{1/2} f\|_{X^*} \| |V|^{1/2} g\|_X \\ &\leq C(K) |V^{1/2} f\|_X \| |V|^{1/2} g\|_X \\ &\leq C(K) \|V^{1/2}\|_{L^2 \to X}^2 \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over normalized functions $f, g \in L^2$, and using Hölder's inequality, we get

$$\left\| |V|^{1/2} R_0(z) V^{1/2} \right\|_{L^2 \to L^2} \leq C(K) \max\{\|V\|_{L^{d/s}}, \|V\|_{L^{(d+1)/2}}\}.$$

□

Lemma 3.3. *Let $T \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a real-valued function*[7]*, and let $K \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a compact subset of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Lambda_c(T)$. Assume that the Gaussian curvature of the level sets $S_\lambda = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : T(\xi) = \lambda\}$ never vanishes for $\lambda \in K \cap \mathbb{R}$. If χ is a smooth compactly supported function, then for $1 \leq p \leq 2(d+1)/(d+3)$, we have*

$$\|\chi(D) R_0(z)\|_{L^p \to L^{p'}} \leq C, \quad z \in K, \tag{3.4}$$

where the constant C depends on d, p, K, T, χ, but not on z.

Proof. We may suppose without loss of generality that χ is supported in a small neighborhood of the origin, $T(0) = 0$ and $\partial_{\xi_1} T(0) = \rho e_1$ for some $\rho > 0$. Otherwise, we use a partition of unity and a linear change of coordinates. By the implicit function theorem, we may then write

$$T(\xi) - \lambda = e(\xi, \lambda)(\xi_1 - h(\xi', \lambda)) \tag{3.5}$$

where $\lambda = \operatorname{Re}(z)$, $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi')$, and h, e are real-valued smooth function, e being bounded away from zero. In a neighborhood of $\xi = 0$ and $\lambda = 0$,

$$e(\xi, \lambda) = \left(\int_0^1 T_{\xi_1}(t\xi_1 + (1-t)h(\xi', \lambda), \xi') \, \mathrm{d}t \right). \tag{3.6}$$

We extend $e(\xi, \lambda)$ and $h(\xi, \lambda)$ arbitrarily to real-valued Schwartz functions on a neighborhood of $\xi \in \operatorname{supp}(\chi)$ and $\lambda \in T(\operatorname{supp}(\chi))$ such that $e(\xi, \lambda) \geq e_1 > 0$. Since $e(D, \lambda)^{-1}$ is smoothing, it is sufficient to prove

$$\|\chi(D)(D_1 - h(D', \lambda) - \mathrm{i} b(D, z))^{-1}\|_{L^p \to L^{p'}} \leq C, \quad z \in K, \tag{3.7}$$

where $b(D, z) = \operatorname{Im}(z) e(D, \lambda)^{-1}$. Denote by $K(\cdot)$ the inverse Fourier transform of $\xi \mapsto \chi(\xi)(\xi_1 - h(\xi', \lambda) - \mathrm{i} b(\xi, z))^{-1}$. Then

$$\chi(D)(D_1 - h(D', \lambda) - \mathrm{i} b(D, z))^{-1} g(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} K(x_1 - y_1, \cdot) * g(\cdot, y_1)(x') \, \mathrm{d}y_1$$

We claim that

$$\|K(x_1 - y_1, \cdot) * g\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})} \leq C(1 + |x_1 - y_1|)^{-\frac{d-1}{2}} \|g\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}, \tag{3.8}$$

$$\|K(x_1 - y_1, \cdot) * g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})} \leq C \|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}. \tag{3.9}$$

Interpolating between (3.8) and (3.9), we get

$$\|K(x_1 - y_1, \cdot) * g\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})} \leq C(1 + |x_1 - y_1|)^{-(d-1)\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}\right)} \|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}.$$

A standard argument using Minkowski's inequality for integrals and fractional integration in one dimension then yields for $p = 2(d+1)/(d+3)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(D_1 - h(D', \lambda) - \mathrm{i} b(D, z))^{-1} g\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\
&\leq \left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \|K(x_1 - y_1, \cdot) * g(y_1, \cdot)\|_{L^{p'}_{x'}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})} \, \mathrm{d}y_1 \right\|_{L^{p'}_{x_1}(\mathbb{R})} \\
&\leq C \left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x_1 - y_1|^{-(d-1)\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}\right)} \|g(y_1, \cdot)\|_{L^p_{x'}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})} \, \mathrm{d}y_1 \right\|_{L^{p'}_{x_1}(\mathbb{R})} \\
&\leq C \left\| \|g(x_1, \cdot)\|_{L^p_{x'}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})} \right\|_{L^p_{x_1}(\mathbb{R})} = C \|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}.
\end{aligned}$$

---

[7] Here, $T(D)$ need not necessarily be one of the operators in Assumption 2.1.

This proves (3.7) for $p = 2(d+1)/(d+3)$. Interpolating with the $L^1 \to L^\infty$-bound (note that $\|K\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$ by (3.11) below), the claim follows.

It remains to prove inequalities (3.8)–(3.9). The convolution kernel K is given by

$$K(x_1, x') = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \mathrm{e}^{2\pi \mathrm{i}[x'\cdot\xi' + x_1 h(\xi', z)]} \psi(\xi', z, x_1)\, \mathrm{d}\xi',$$

where

$$\sup_{x_1 \in \mathbb{R}} \psi(\xi', z, x_1) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{2\pi \mathrm{i} x_1 \xi_1} \chi(\xi_1, \xi')(\xi_1 - \mathrm{i}b(\xi_1, \xi', z))^{-1}\, \mathrm{d}\xi_1$$

We claim that

$$|\partial_{\xi'}^\alpha \psi(\xi', z, x_1)| \leq C_\alpha. \tag{3.10}$$

Inequality (3.9) then follows from Plancherel's theorem, and inequality (3.8) follows from stationary phase estimates, see e.g. [19, Prop. VIII.2.6]. To prove (3.10), note that $\partial_{\xi'}^\alpha a(\cdot, \xi') \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ with Schwartz norms bounded independent of ξ'. By the convolution theorem, it would be sufficient to prove

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{e}^{2\pi \mathrm{i} x_1 \xi_1} (\xi_1 - \mathrm{i}b(\xi_1, \xi', z))^{-1}\, \mathrm{d}\xi_1 \right| \leq C. \tag{3.11}$$

The reason why this is true is that the Hilbert transform $1/\xi_1$ has a bounded Fourier transform. Indeed, let $e_1, e_2 > 0$ be such that $e_1 \leq e(\xi, \lambda) \leq e_2$. Then comparison with the Hilbert transform yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \frac{1}{\xi_1 - \mathrm{i}b(\xi_1, \xi', z)} - \frac{1}{\xi_1} \right| \mathrm{d}\xi_1 \leq \frac{e_2}{e_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{|\xi_1||\xi_1 - \mathrm{i}|}\, \mathrm{d}\xi_1 \leq C.$$

This proves (3.11). □

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We prove case b), case a) being similar and easier. Consider $T(\xi) = |\xi|^s$ or $T(\xi) = (1 + |\xi|^2)^{s/2} - 1$ first. These are Fourier multipliers corresponding to radial functions. Thus the level sets S_λ are spheres of size $\mathcal{O}(1)$ for all $\lambda \in K$. In particular, their Gaussian curvature is non-vanishing. Let $\Omega, \Omega' \subset \mathbb{C}$ be open sets such that $K \subset\subset \Omega \subset\subset \Omega'$. Pick a bump function χ such that $\mathrm{supp}(\chi) \subset T^{-1}(\Omega' \cap \mathbb{R})$ (the preimage of a compact set under T is compact, i.e. T is proper) and $\chi = 1$ on $T^{-1}(\Omega \cap \mathbb{R})$. Lemma 3.3 implies

$$\|\chi(D) R_0(z)\|_{L^{\frac{2(d+1)}{d+3}} \to L^{\frac{2(d+1)}{d-1}}} \leq C(K). \tag{3.12}$$

By the choice of χ, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|(1 - \chi(\xi))|^2}{|T(\xi) - z|^2} (1 + |\xi|^2)^{s/2} |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2\, \mathrm{d}\xi \leq C(K)^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1 + |\xi|^2)^{-s/2} |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2\, \mathrm{d}\xi.$$

Then

$$\|(1 - \chi(D)) R_0(z) f\|_{H^{s/2}} \leq C(K) \|f\|_{H^{-s/2}}.$$

By Sobolev embedding,

$$H^{s/2} \hookrightarrow L^{\frac{2d}{d-s}}, \quad L^{\frac{2d}{d+s}} \hookrightarrow H^{-s/2},$$

this implies that

$$\|(1 - \chi(D)) R_0(z)\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+s}} \to L^{\frac{2d}{d-s}}} \leq C(K). \tag{3.13}$$

Let $f = f_1 + f_2$ where $f_1 = \chi(D)f$. Then, by (3.12) and (3.13),

$$\|R_0(z)f_1\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d-s}}} + \|R_0(z)f_2\|_{L^{\frac{2(d+1)}{d-1}}} \le C(K)\|f\|_{L^{\frac{2d}{d+s}} \cap L^{\frac{2(d+1)}{d+3}}}.$$

This proves the claim in this case.

Now consider $H_0 \in \{\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}_1\}$. Since we have $\mathcal{D}_0^2 = -\Delta$ and $\mathcal{D}_1^2 = 1 - \Delta$, the resolvents are given by

$$(\mathcal{D}_0 - z)^{-1} = (\mathcal{D}_0 + z)(-\Delta - z^2)^{-1}, \tag{3.14}$$

$$(\mathcal{D}_1 - z)^{-1} = (\mathcal{D}_1 + z)(-\Delta - (z^2 - 1))^{-1}. \tag{3.15}$$

The proof of the claim is then a straightforward adaptation of the previous argument. Note that in the analogue of (3.12) in the case of $\mathcal{D}_0$,

$$\|(\mathcal{D}_0 + z)\chi(D)(-\Delta - z^2)^{-1}\|_{L^{\frac{2(d+1)}{d+3}} \to L^{\frac{2(d+1)}{d-1}}} \le C(K),$$

the multiplier $\mathcal{D}_0 + z$ can be absorbed into $\chi(D)$ since the frequencies are bounded. □

4. Uniform resolvent estimates in Schatten spaces

Theorem 4.1. *Let $H_0 = T(D)$, and let V be a complex-valued potential such that Assumptions 2.1–2.2 hold. Then there exists a positive function $N(z)$, defined on $\rho(H_0)$ and having a continuous extension up to $\mathbb{C} \setminus \Lambda_c(H_0)$, such that the following inequalities hold.*

a) *If $s \ge 2d/(d+1)$ and $V \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $d/s \le q \le (d+1)/2$, then*

$$\||V|^{1/2}R_0(z)V^{1/2}\|_{\mathfrak{S}^\alpha} \le N(z)\|V\|_{L^q}, \tag{4.1}$$

where $\alpha = q(d-1)/(d-q)$.

b) *If $s < 2d/(d+1)$ and $V \in L^{d/s}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{(d+1)/2}$, then*

$$\||V|^{1/2}R_0(z)V^{1/2}\|_{\mathfrak{S}^\alpha} \le N(z)\|V\|_{L^d \cap L^{(d+1)/2}}, \tag{4.2}$$

where $\alpha = 3$ for $d = 2$ and $\alpha > d/s$ for $d \ge 3$.

Remark 4.2. From scaling arguments, one can obtain the following estimates for $N(z)$ from the proof.

- If $H_0 = (-\Delta)^{s/2}$, then $N(z) \le C|z|^{\frac{d}{sq}-1}$ if $s \ge 2d/(d+1)$ and $N(z) \le C(1+|z|)^{\frac{2d}{s(d+1)}-1}$ if $s < 2d/(d+1)$.
- If $H_0 = (1-\Delta)^{s/2} - 1$, then

  $$N(z) \le C \begin{cases} |z|^{\frac{d}{2q}-1} & \text{if } |z| < 1, \\ |z|^{\frac{d}{sq}-1} & \text{if } |z| \ge 1, \end{cases} \quad \text{and } s \ge 2d/(d+1),$$

  and

  $$N(z) \le C \begin{cases} |z|^{\frac{s}{2}-1} & \text{if } |z| < 1, \\ |z|^{\frac{2d}{s(d+1)}-1} & \text{if } |z| \ge 1, \end{cases} \quad \text{and } s < 2d/(d+1).$$

- If $H_0 = \mathcal{D}_0$, then $N(z) \le C(1+|z|)^{\frac{d-1}{d+1}}$.
- If $H_0 = \mathcal{D}_1$, then

  $$N(z) \le C \begin{cases} |z^2-1|^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } |z^2 - 1| < 1, \\ |z|^{\frac{d-1}{d+1}} & \text{if } |z^2 - 1| \ge 1. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 4.3. *Let $T \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a real-valued function, and let χ be a smooth compactly supported function such that T has no critical points in* $\mathrm{supp}(\chi)$. *Assume that the Gaussian curvature of the level sets $S_\lambda = \{\xi \in \mathrm{supp}(\chi) : T(\xi) = \lambda\}$ never vanishes. Then for $1 \le q \le (d+1)/2$, we have*

$$\| |V|^{1/2}\chi(D)R_0(z)V^{1/2}\|_{\mathfrak{S}^{q(d-1)/(d-q)}} \le C\|V\|_{L^q} \tag{4.3}$$

for all $z \in \rho(T)$. The constant C depends on d, p, T, χ, but not on z.

Proof. 1. Assume first that λ lies outside a compact neighborhood U of $T(\mathrm{supp}(\chi))$. Then the kernel of $\chi(\xi)(T(\xi)-z)^{-1}$ is Schwartz. Let $\widetilde{\chi}$ be a bump function with the same properties as χ and such that $\widetilde{\chi} = 1$ on the support of χ. By the Kato-Seiler-Simon inequality (see e.g. [18, Thm. 4.1]),

$$\| |V|^{1/2}\chi(D)R_0(z)V^{1/2}\|_{\mathfrak{S}^q} \le C\|V\|_{L^q}. \tag{4.4}$$

This is better than (4.3) since $q \le q(d-1)/(d-q)$.

2. Assume $\lambda \in U$. We prove (4.3) for $z = \lambda \pm \mathrm{i}0$ first. Note that the limits

$$(T(\xi) - \lambda \pm \mathrm{i}0)^{-1} = p.v.(T(\xi)-\lambda)^{-1} \pm \mathrm{i}\pi\delta(T(\xi)-\lambda), \tag{4.5}$$

$$(T(\xi) - \lambda \pm \mathrm{i}0)^{-\sigma} = (T(\xi)-\lambda)_+^{-\sigma} + \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\pi\sigma}(T(\xi)-\lambda)_-^{-\sigma}, \quad \sigma \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{N}, \tag{4.6}$$

exist in the sense of tempered distributions, see e.g. [7, Example 5.5, p.19] or [12]. We follow the outline of the proof of [10, Theorem 12] and apply complex interpolation to the family $S_\zeta = |V|^{\zeta/2}\chi(D)R_0(\lambda\pm\mathrm{i}0)^\zeta V^{\zeta/2}$. We shall prove the following bounds,

$$\|S_\zeta\|_{\mathfrak{S}^\infty} \le C\mathrm{e}^{C'(\mathrm{Im}\zeta)^2}, \quad \mathrm{Re}\zeta = 0, \tag{4.7}$$

$$\|S_\zeta\|_{\mathfrak{S}^2} \le C\mathrm{e}^{C'(\mathrm{Im}\zeta)^2}\|V\|^{\mathrm{Re}\zeta}_{L^{\frac{2d\mathrm{Re}\zeta}{d-1+2\mathrm{Re}\zeta}}}, \quad 1 \le \mathrm{Re}\zeta \le (d+1)/2, \tag{4.8}$$

where the constant C is independent of $\lambda \in U$. By [18, Thm. 2.9] it then follows that

$$\|S_1\|_{\mathfrak{S}^{2a}} \le C\|V\|_{L^{\frac{2a}{d-1+2a}}}, \quad 1 \le a \le (d+1)/2. \tag{4.9}$$

By a change of variables $2a = q(d-1)/(d-q)$, this is the claimed inequality. Inequality (4.7) trivially follows from Plancherel's theorem. Inequality (4.8) would follow from the pointwise kernel bounds

$$|\chi(D)R_0(\lambda\pm\mathrm{i}0)^{a+\mathrm{i}t}(x-y)| \le C\mathrm{e}^{C't^2}(1+|x-y|)^{-\frac{d+1}{2}+a} \tag{4.10}$$

and the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality. It remains to prove (4.10). As in the proof of Lemma 3.3, we write $T(\xi)-\lambda$ locally as in (3.5). Without loss of generality we may assume that $e(\xi,\lambda)$ is strictly positive. Then

$$(T(D)-\lambda\pm\mathrm{i}0)^{-a-\mathrm{i}t} = e(D,\lambda)^{-a-\mathrm{i}t}(D_1 - h(D',\lambda)\pm\mathrm{i}0)^{-a-\mathrm{i}t}$$

Since $e(\xi,\lambda)$ is a Schwartz function, (4.10) would thus follow if we proved

$$|\chi(D)(D_1 - h(D',\lambda)\pm\mathrm{i}0)^{-a-\mathrm{i}t}(x-y)| \le C\mathrm{e}^{C't^2}(1+|x-y|)^{-\frac{d+1}{2}+a}. \tag{4.11}$$

Similarly as in the proof of Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\chi(D)(D_1 - h(D',\lambda)\pm\mathrm{i}0)^{-a+\mathrm{i}t}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \mathrm{e}^{2\pi\mathrm{i}[x'\cdot\xi' + x_1 h(\xi',\lambda)]}\psi(\xi',\lambda,x_1)\,\mathrm{d}\xi',$$

this time with[8]

$$\psi(\xi', \lambda, x_1) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(a - \mathrm{i}t)} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(a-\mathrm{i}t)\pi/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (x_1 - s)_{\pm}^{a-\mathrm{i}t-1} a(\widehat{\cdot}, \xi')(-s)\, \mathrm{d}s.$$

Note that $\Gamma(z)|^{-1} \leq C^{\pi^2 |\mathrm{Im} z|^2}$. A Schwartz tails argument then yields

$$|\partial_{\xi'}^{\alpha} \psi(\xi', \lambda, x_1)| \leq C_{\alpha} \mathrm{e}^{C' t^2} (1 + |x_1|)^{a-1}.$$

Thus, (4.10) follows again from stationary phase.

3. We have proved that (4.3) holds for $z = \lambda \pm \mathrm{i}0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Next, we are going to use the Phragmén-Lindelöf maximum principle to prove that the inequality holds in $\mathbb{C}^{\pm}$. This part is a bit technical and will thus be postponed to the appendix. □

Remark 4.4. By inspection of the proof, one checks that the constant C in (4.3) depends on T and a only through

- a lower bound for the Gaussian curvature of S_{λ},
- a lower bound for $|\nabla T|$ on $\mathrm{supp}(\chi)$,
- The size of $\mathrm{supp}(\chi)$ and finitely many Schwartz semi-norms of χ.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. a) Let $K \subset\subset \Omega \subset\subset \Omega' \subset\subset \mathbb{C} \setminus \Lambda_c(H_0)$, and let χ_0 be a bump function supported on Ω' and such that $\chi_0 = 1$ on Ω. Lemma 4.3 yields for all $z \in K$

$$\| |V|^{1/2} \chi_0(D) R_0(z) V^{1/2} \|_{\mathfrak{S}^{q(d-1)/(d-q)}} \leq C(\Omega') \|V\|_{L^q}. \tag{4.12}$$

It remains to prove

$$\| |V|^{1/2} (1 - \chi_0(D)) R_0(z) V^{1/2} \|_{\mathfrak{S}^{q(d-1)/(d-q)}} \leq C(\Omega) \|V\|_{L^q}. \tag{4.13}$$

For $q > d/s$, the Kato-Seiler-Simon inequality yields the better bound

$$\| |V|^{1/2} (1 - \chi_0(D)) R_0(z) V^{1/2} \|_{\mathfrak{S}^{q}} \leq C(\Omega) \|V\|_{L^q}. \tag{4.14}$$

For $q = d/s$, we use the kernel bound (see [19, Prop. VI.4.1])

$$|(1 - \chi_0(D)) R_0(z)(x - y)| \leq C |x - y|^{s-d} \mathbf{1}\{|x - y| \leq 1\} + \mathcal{O}(\langle x - y \rangle^{-N})$$

and the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality to show that a better bound than (4.13) holds with the $\mathfrak{S}^2$ norm, provided[9] $d/2 < s < d$. For the case $0 < s \leq d/2$, we use complex interpolation on the family $|V|^{\zeta/2}(1 - \chi(D)) R_0(z)^{\zeta} V^{\zeta/2}$. Similarly as before, we have the kernel bounds

$$|(1 - \chi_0(D)) R_0(z)^{a+\mathrm{i}t}(x - y)| \leq C(\Omega) |x - y|^{as-d} \mathbf{1}\{|x - y| \leq 1\} + \mathcal{O}(\langle x - y \rangle^{-N})$$

where $as - d < 0$. This follows again from [19, Prop. VI.4.1]; note that $C(\Omega)$ grows sub-double-exponentially since we have

$$\left| \partial_{\xi}^{\alpha} \left[(1 - \chi_0(\xi)) (T(\xi) - z)^{-a-\mathrm{i}t} \right] \right| \leq C_{\alpha} \mathrm{e}^{\pi |t|} \langle \xi \rangle^{-as-|\alpha|}.$$

This is true if we choose the branch of the argument function satisfying $-\pi \leq \arg(\cdot) \leq \pi$. Let $a = d/(2s) + \epsilon$ with $0 < \epsilon < d/(4s)$. Then $as - d < 0$ and $0 < 2(as - d) < d$, so the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality together with the previous bound yields

$$\| |V|^{\zeta/2} (1 - \chi_0(D)) R_0(z)^{\zeta} V^{\zeta/2} \|_{\mathfrak{S}^2} \leq C(\Omega) \|V\|_{L^{d/s}}^{a}, \quad \mathrm{Re}\zeta = a.$$

---

[8] Here, we use an explicit formula for the Fourier transform of $(\xi_1 \pm \mathrm{i}0)^{-a+\mathrm{i}t}$, see e.g. [12]

[9] This reflects the conditions in the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality.

Interpolation with the trivial bound (4.7) yields

$$\| |V|^{1/2}(1-\chi_0(D))R_0(z)V^{1/2}\|_{\mathfrak{S}^{2a}} \leq C(\Omega)\|V\|_{L^{d/s}}, \tag{4.15}$$

Since $s<d$, we can always choose $\epsilon>0$ such that $2a=d/s+2\epsilon<(d-1)/(s-1)$. Since $q(d-1)/(d-q)=(d-1)/(s-1)$ for $q=d/s$ inequality (4.15) is therefore better than (4.13).

b) One combines (4.12) with $q=(d+1)/2$ and (4.15) with $a=d/(2s)+\epsilon$ as above. The Schatten spaces in the estimates are $\mathfrak{S}^{(d+1)/(d-1)}$ and $\mathfrak{S}^{2a}$, respectively. Since $s<2d/(d+1)$, we have $\max\{(d+1)/(d-1),d/s)\}=d/s$ if $d\geq 3$ and $\max\{3,2/s\}=3$ if $d=2$. Since $\mathfrak{S}^{q_1}\subset\mathfrak{S}^{q_2}$ for $q_1<q_2$, the claim follows. □

Proof of Remark 4.2. a) Case $H_0=(-\Delta)^{s/2}$, $s\geq 2d/(d+1)$: The claim follows by scaling since the resolvent kernel satisfies $R_0(x-y;z)=|z|^{d/s-1}R_0(|z|^{1/s}(x-y);z/|z|)$. Actually, (4.9) does not scale directly, but (4.8) does, while the bound in (4.7) is uniform in z. Therefore, the factor $|z|^{\frac{d}{sq}-1}$ comes out correctly in the complex interpolation step. The same argument applies to the other two inequalities used in the proof of Theorem 4.1, namely (4.4) and (4.13), since both are proved by complex interpolation between a $\mathfrak{S}^\infty$ and a $\mathfrak{S}^2$ bound (see [18, Thm. 4.1] for a proof of the former).

Case $H_0=(1-\Delta)^{s/2}-1$, $s\geq 2d/(d+1)$: Write $z=\lambda+\mathrm{i}\epsilon$. In order to find the singularities and decay of $N(z)$, we consider the following cases.

i) $\delta\leq\lambda\leq\delta^{-1}$ and $0<|\epsilon|\leq 1$,
ii) $-\delta\leq\lambda\leq 0$ and $0<|\epsilon|\leq 1$,
iii) $0<\lambda<\delta$ and $\lambda\leq|\epsilon|<1$,
iv) $0<\lambda<\delta$ and $0<|\epsilon|<\lambda$,
v) $\lambda<-\delta$ or $|\epsilon|\geq 1$,
vi) $\delta^{-1}<\lambda$ and $0<|\epsilon|<1$.

Here, $\delta>0$ is some fixed small constant. In case i) Lemma 4.3 yields a uniform bound $N(z)\leq C(\delta)$. In cases ii)-iii), pick a bump function ψ_0 such that $\psi_0=1$ on $B(0,2\delta)$. The estimates for $(1-\psi_0(D))R_0(z)$ are uniform since $T(\xi)=(1+|\xi|^2)^{s/2}-1$ has no critical point in the support of $1-\psi_0$. For $\xi\in\operatorname{supp}(\psi_0)$ we have $|T(\xi)-z|\geq|z|/2$. Hence, Kato-Seiler-Simon yields

$$\| |V|^{1/2}\psi_0(D)R_0(z)V^{1/2}\|_{\mathfrak{S}^q}\leq N(z)\|V\|_{L^q},$$

with

$$N(z)\leq C\left(\int_{\operatorname{supp}(\psi_0)}|T(\xi)-z|^{-q}\,\mathrm{d}\xi\right)^{1/q}\leq C|z|^{\frac{d}{2q}-1}. \tag{4.16}$$

In case iv), pick a bump function χ such that $\operatorname{supp}(\chi)\subset\{1/2\leq|\xi|\leq 3/2\}$ and $\chi=1$ on $\{3/4\leq|\xi|\leq 5/4\}$. For the part $(1-\chi(|z|^{-1/2}D))R_0(z)$ the same argument as above applies. For the part $\chi(|z|^{-1/2}D)R_0(z)$, we use an approximate scaling argument. Let $\widetilde{T}(\xi)=|z|^{-1}T(|z|^{1/2}\xi)$ and let $\widetilde{R}_0(z)$ be the resolvent of the corresponding multiplier. Then

$$[\chi(|z|^{-1/2}D)R_0(z)](x-y)=|z|^{d/2-1}[\chi(D)\widetilde{R}_0(z/|z|)](|z|^{1/2}(x-y)). \tag{4.17}$$

Note that by Taylor's theorem,

$$|\nabla\widetilde{T}(\xi)|\approx 1,\quad |D^2\widetilde{T}(\xi)|\approx 1,\quad \xi\in\operatorname{supp}(\chi). \tag{4.18}$$

Therefore, Lemma 4.3 and Remark 4.2 imply that

$$\||V|^{1/2}\chi(D)\widetilde{R_0}(z/|z|)V^{1/2}\|_{\mathfrak{S}^{q(d-1)/(d-q)}} \leq C\|V\|_{L^q}$$

with a constant independent of z. The same scaling argument as in the homogeneous case $H_0 = (-\Delta)^{s/2}$ together with (4.17) then yields

$$\||V|^{1/2}\chi(|z|^{-1/2}D)R_0(z)V^{1/2}\|_{\mathfrak{S}^{q(d-1)/(d-q)}} \leq C|z|^{\frac{d}{2q}-1}\|V\|_{L^q}.$$

Case v) is similar to cases ii)-iii) but yields a bound $N(z) \leq C|z|^{\frac{d}{sq}-1}$ instead of (4.16). Case vi) is similar to case iv), but here one uses $\widetilde{T}(\xi) = |z|^{-1}T(|\xi|^{1/s}\xi)$ as the rescaled operator and $\chi(|z|^{1/s}\xi)$ as the localization. The uniform bounds (4.18) are a consequence of the Taylor expansion of $T(\xi)$ at infinity.

Case $H_0 \in \{\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}_1\}$: One uses (3.14). The modifications are similar as in the proof of Theorem 3.1. □

5. Proof of Theorem 2.3

Proof. Corollary 3.2 and the Birman-Schwinger principle imply that $H_0 + V$ has no eigenvalues $z \in K$ if $\|V\|$ is sufficiently small.

To prove (2.1) we define the holomorphic function

$$\mathbb{C} \setminus [0,\infty) \ni z \mapsto h(z) = \operatorname*{det}_{\lceil \alpha \rceil}(I + V^{1/2}(H_0 - z)^{-1}|V|^{1/2}) \in \mathbb{C}, \tag{5.1}$$

where α is the exponent in the the bounds of Theorem 4.1. By [18, Thm. 9.2 b)] and Theorem 4.1 we have the bound

$$\log|h(z)| \leq C\|V^{1/2}(H_0 - z)^{-1}|V|^{1/2}\|_{\mathfrak{S}_\alpha}^{\alpha} \leq N(z)^{\alpha}\|V\|^{\alpha}, \tag{5.2}$$

where α is as in Theorem 4.1. We need to map $\rho(H_0)$ conformally onto the unit disk $\mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{C}$. Due to the special form of $\rho(H_0)$ we can write down such a map explicitly. In the case $H_0 = \mathcal{D}_0$, we have $\rho(H_0) = \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{C}^-$, so we need two conformal maps $\varphi^{\pm}$ in this case. We can choose e.g.

$$\varphi^+ : \mathbb{C}^+ \to \mathbb{D}, \quad \varphi^+(z) = \frac{z - \mathrm{i}}{z + \mathrm{i}}, \tag{5.3}$$

and an obvious modification for φ^-. In the case $H_0 = (-\Delta)^{s/2}$ or $H_0 = (1 - \Delta)^{s/2} - 1$, we can take $\varphi^+(\sqrt{\cdot})$, where $\sqrt{\cdot}$ is the principal branch of the square root on $\mathbb{C} \setminus [0,\infty)$. Finally, for $H_0 = \mathcal{D}_1$, we compose the last map with $z \mapsto (z-1)/(z+1) : \rho(H_0) \to \mathbb{C} \setminus [0,\infty)$. We denote the resulting map by $\psi_0 : \rho(H_0) \to \mathbb{D}$. We will need a normalized version of this map. We fix $z_0 \in \rho(H_0 + V)$, $|z_0| > 1$, and set $\widetilde{z_0} = \psi_0(z_0) \in \mathbb{D}$. With the normalization

$$\nu : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{D}, \quad \nu(w) = \frac{w + \widetilde{z_0}}{1 + \widetilde{z_0}w}, \tag{5.4}$$

we then define the map $\psi = \nu^{-1} \circ \psi_0$, which has the property $\psi(z_0) = 0$. In all cases, ψ extends to a $C^\infty(K)$ diffeomorphism.

We note that a point z_0 as above always exists, but it may depend on V instead of on $\|V\|$ only. This is due to the fact that $N(z)$ in Theorem 4.1 may not go to zero at infinity (and indeed may diverge). This is only the case if we assume Assumption 2.2a) with $q = d/s$ or Assumption 2.2b). To find such a z_0, we decompose $V = V_1 + V_2$, where $V_1 = V\chi\{x : |V(x)| \geq \rho\}$ and ρ to be chosen sufficiently large.

Then $V_2 \in L^\infty$, and thus $\sigma(H_0+V)$ lies in a ρ-neighborhood of $\sigma(H_0+V_1)$. By Chebyshev's inequality,

$$|\{x : |V(x)| \geq \rho\}| \leq \frac{\|V\|_{L^{d/s}}}{\rho^{d/s}}.$$

Dominated convergence shows that $\|V_2\|_{L^{d/s}}$ tends to zero as $\rho \to \infty$. Choosing ρ sufficiently large, we infer as in the beginning of the proof that $\sigma(H_0+V_1) \subset \sigma(H_0)$.[10] We can thus pick any z_0 outside a ρ-neighborhood of $\sigma(H_0)$. If we assume Assumption 2.2 a) with $d/s < q \leq (d+1)/2$, then Theorem 6.3 shows that z_0 may be chosen as

$$z_0 = -C\|V\|_{L^q}^{sq/(sq-d)}$$

for C sufficiently large. With this choice of z_0 (note $h(z_0) \neq 0$), let us define a holomorphic function on the unit disk,

$$g : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{C}, \quad g(w) = \frac{h(\psi^{-1}(w))}{h(z_0)}. \tag{5.5}$$

Note the normalization $g(0) = 1$. By (5.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log|g(w)| &\leq CN(\psi^{-1}(w))^\alpha \|V\|^\alpha - \log|h(z_0)| \\ &\leq C(V)\prod_i |w - w_c^i|^{-\mu_c^i}|w - w_\infty|^{-\mu_\infty} \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

where $\{w_c^i\}_i = \psi(\Lambda_c(H_0))$ and $w_\infty = \psi(\infty)$, and where μ_c, μ_∞ are non-negative numbers depending on d, s, q and the conformal map ψ (and that could be computed from the estimates in Remark 4.2). We will not need the precise value of μ for the time being[11]. Note that the constant $C(V)$ depends on V via $\|V\|$ and z_0. By a theorem of Borichev, Golinskii and Kupin [2, Thm. 03], it follows that

$$\sum_{g(w)=0} (1-|w|)\prod_i |w - w_c^i|^{(\mu_c - 1+\epsilon)_+}|w - w_\infty|^{(\mu_\infty - 1 + \epsilon)_+} \leq C(V). \tag{5.7}$$

Writing the last sum in terms of z instead of w and restricting summation to $z \in K$, we obtain

$$\sum_{z \in \sigma(H_0+V)\cap K} \operatorname{dist}(z, \sigma(H_0)) \leq C(K, V). \tag{5.8}$$

Here we used that, by Koebe's distortion theorem, $(1-|w|) \approx \operatorname{dist}(z, \sigma(H_0))$ for $z \in K$ since ψ is a $C^\infty(K)$ diffeomorphism. □

Remark 5.1. As already pointed out, we only need very rough bounds for $N(z)$ in the above proof. It might be asked why we need bounds $N(z)$ for $z \notin K$; after all, the summation is only over $z \in K$. Suppose $K' \subset\subset \Omega \subset\subset K$, where $\Omega \subset \rho(H_0)$ is a domain. We could use the Riemann mapping theorem to map $\psi : \Omega \to \mathbb{D}$ conformally. The bound for $\log|g(w)|$ in (5.6) would then be uniform and (5.8) would hold with K replaced by K', with a bound depending on $\sup_{z\in K'}|\psi'(z)|$. But since $\operatorname{dist}(K', \sigma(H_0)) > 0$, this is obvious as the sum is finite. To get a non-trivial result, we need $\operatorname{dist}(\Omega, \sigma(H_0)) = 0$, and hence $\partial\Omega$ could be non-smooth. It is generally not true that ψ extends smoothly up to the boundary.

---

[10] We only proved the absence of eigenvalues. However, by standard arguments H_0+V can only have discrete spectrum outside $\sigma(H_0)$.

[11] We give some concrete examples in Section 6.

6. Further results

6.1. Bounds on individual eigenvalues.

Theorem 6.1. *a) Let* $H_0 = (-\Delta)^{s/2}$ *and* $2d/(d+1) \leq s < d$*, and assume* $V \in L^q$ *with* $d/s \leq q \leq (d+1)/2$*. Then any eigenvalue* $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0,\infty)$ *of* $H_0 + V$ *satisfies*

$$|z|^{q-\frac{d}{s}} \leq C\|V\|_{L^q}^q. \tag{6.1}$$

b) Let $H_0 = T(D)$ *with* $T(D)$ *as in Assumption 2.1 and with* $0 < s < d$*, and assume* $V \in L^q$ *with* $d/s \leq q$*. Then any eigenvalue* $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(H_0)$ *of* $H_0 + V$ *satisfies*

$$(|\mathrm{Im} z|/|\mathrm{Re} z|)^{d/s-1}|\mathrm{Im} z|^{q-d/s} \leq C\|V\|_{L^q}^q \tag{6.2}$$

Remark 6.2. Inequality (6.1) for $s = 2$ was proved in [8]. Inequality (6.2) is much less precise, but it still gives better bounds for z close to $\sigma(H_0)$ compared to the often used estimate

$$1 \leq \||V|^{1/2}R_0(z)V^{1/2}\| \leq C\|(T(\cdot)-z)^{-1}\|_{L^q}\|V\|_{L^q},$$

which is an easy consequence of the Kato-Seiler-Simon inequality if $q > d/s$.

Proof. The theorem is proved using the Birman-Schwinger principle, as before. Inequality (6.1) follows from Corollary 3.2, scaling and Hölder's inequality. Inequality (6.2) would be a consequence of the resolvent bound

$$\|(R_0(\lambda + \mathrm{i}\mu)\, f\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C|\lambda|^{\frac{d-s}{s}\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{p'}\right)}|\mu|^{\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{p'}\right)-1}\|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \tag{6.3}$$

where $1/p - 1/p' = 1/q$. By scaling, we may assume $|\lambda| = 1$. We may also assume that $|\mu| \leq 1$, otherwise the bounds are uniform. On the one hand, we have the Sobolev inequality (3.13) for $(1-\chi(D))R_0(z)$, which is better than (6.3)[12]. On the other hand, for $\chi(D)R_0(z)$ one interpolates between the bounds

$$\|\chi(D)R_0(z)\|_{L^1\to L^\infty} \leq C,$$
$$\|\chi(D)R_0(z)\|_{L^2\to L^2} \leq |\mu|^{-1}.$$

The first follows from comparison with the Hilbert transform (3.11), the second is obvious. □

Theorem 6.3. *Let* $H_0 = (-\Delta)^{s/2}$ *or* $H_0 = \mathcal{D}_0$*,* $s \geq \frac{d}{d+1}$*, and let* $V \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *with*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{2s} \leq q \leq \frac{d+1}{2} & \text{if } 2s < d, \\ 1 < q \leq \frac{d+1}{2} & \text{if } 2s = d, \\ 1 \leq q \leq \frac{d+1}{2} & \text{if } 2s > d. \end{cases}$$

Assume that $V = \mathrm{i}W$ *with* $W \geq 0$*. Then every eigenvalue* $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(H_0)$ *of* $H_0 + V$ *satisfies*

$$|z|^{2q-d/s}|\mathrm{Im} z|^{-q} \leq C\|V\|_q^q. \tag{6.4}$$

Remark 6.4. Theorem 6.3 generalizes [14, Thm. 9] for Schrödinger operators with purely imaginary potentials in three dimensions.

---

[12] Inequality (3.13) is only stated for $1/p - 1/p' = s/d$. The general case is obtained by interpolation with the $L^2 \to L^2$ bound.

Proof. Suppose z is an eigenvalue of $H_0 + \mathrm{i}W$. By the Birman-Schwinger principle, this is equivalent to 1 being an eigenvalue of the operator

$$Q(z) := \mathrm{i}\sqrt{W} R_0(z)\sqrt{W}, \tag{6.5}$$

i.e. there exists $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\|f\| = 1$, such that $Q(z)f = f$. It follows that

$$(\operatorname{Re} Q(z))f, f) = 1. \tag{6.6}$$

On the other hand, since

$$\operatorname{Re} Q(z) = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{W}\operatorname{Im}(R_0(z))\sqrt{W},$$

we have

$$\|\operatorname{Re} Q(z)\| \le \frac{1}{2}\|V\|_{L^{\frac{p}{2-p}}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\|\operatorname{Im}(R_0(z))\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)\to L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{6.7}$$

In view of the equality $\operatorname{Im}(R_0(z)) = (\operatorname{Im} z)R_0(z)R_0(\overline{z})$, it remains to prove the following resolvent estimate,

$$\|R_0(z)R_0(\overline{z})\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)\to L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \le C|z|^{\frac{d}{s}\left(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{p'}\right)-2} \tag{6.8}$$

where $\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{p'} = \frac{1}{q}$ and q as in the assumptions of the theorem. By scaling, the proof of (6.8) reduces to the case $|z| = 1$. The estimate of $(1-\chi(D))R_0(z)$ is as in (3.13), but with $2s$ instead of s. The estimate for $\chi(D)R_0(z)$ is further reduced to the cases $z = 1 \pm \mathrm{i}0$ and $z = -1 \pm \mathrm{i}0$ by the Phragmén-Lindelöf maximum principle (the proof is similar and somewhat easier than the one given in the appendix). The case $z = -1 \pm \mathrm{i}0$ is again handled by the Sobolev inequality (3.13). For $z = 1 \pm \mathrm{i}0$, one notes that $\operatorname{Im} R_0(1 \pm \mathrm{i}0)f = c\,\widehat{\mathrm{d}\sigma_{S^{d-1}}} * f$. The result thus follows from the TT^* version of the Stein Tomas theorem [20]. □

Remark 6.5. The bounds (6.1) and (6.4) can be extended to all eigenvalues of $H_0 + V$, see [11, Prop. 3.1].

6.2. **Weighted eigenvalue sums.**

Theorem 6.6. *Let $H_0 = (-\Delta)^{s/2}$, $s \ge 2d/(d+1)$, and let $V \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $d/s < q \le (d+1)/2$. Then*

$$\sum_{z\in\sigma(H_0+V)} |z|^{-(1-\epsilon)/2}\operatorname{dist}(z,\sigma(H_0)) \le C\|V\|_{L^q}^{(1+\epsilon)q/(sq-d)}, \tag{6.9}$$

where $\epsilon \ge 0$ if $2d/(d+1) \le s < 4d/(1+2d)$, and

$$\begin{cases} \epsilon \ge 0 & \text{if } \frac{d}{s} < q < \frac{d(2d+s-2)}{s(2d-1)}, \\ \epsilon > \frac{2}{s}\frac{d-1}{d-q}(sq-d) - 1 & \text{if } \frac{d(2d+s-2)}{s(2d-1)} \le q \le \frac{d+1}{2}, \end{cases} \quad \text{and}$$

if $s < 4d/(1+2d)$.

Remark 6.7. The case $H_0 = -\Delta$ was proved in [10, Thm. 16]. For $H_0 = (1-\Delta)^{s/2} - 1$ the estimate (6.9) holds with s replaced by 2. The reason is the singularity of $N(z)$ in Remark 4.2 at $z = 0$.

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of [10, Thm. 16]. One just replaces their estimate (56) by

$$\log|h(z)| \le C|z|^{\frac{\alpha d}{sq}-\alpha}\|V\|_{L^q}^{\alpha},$$

resulting from [18, Thm. 9.2 b)], Theorem 4.1 and Remark 4.2. □

Theorem 6.8. *Let* $H_0 = \mathcal{D}_0$*, and let* $V \in L^d(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{(d+1)/2}$*. Then*

$$\sum_{h(z)=0} \operatorname{dist}(z, \sigma(H_0))(1+|z|)^{-\alpha\frac{d-1}{d+1}-1-\epsilon} \leq C(V), \tag{6.10}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$*,* $\alpha = 3$ *if* $d = 2$ *and* $\alpha > d$ *if* $d \geq 3$*.*

Proof. We prove the result for the part of the sum with $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$; the part with $z \in \mathbb{C}^-$ is treated similarly. As in the proof of Theorem 2.3, we have the estimate (5.6), where $\psi = \nu^{-1} \circ \varphi^+$ with φ^+ and ν as in (5.3) and (5.4). Abusing notation, we write $\nu = \nu(w)$, $w = \nu^{-1}(\nu)$. Then

$$\nu = \frac{z - \mathrm{i}}{z + \mathrm{i}}, \quad z = -\mathrm{i}\frac{\nu + 1}{\nu - 1}.$$

Since z_0 has been fixed, the normalization map $\nu : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{D}$ extends to a $C^\infty(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ diffeomorphism with

$$c_1(V) \leq |\nu'(w)| \leq c_2(V), \quad w \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}. \tag{6.11}$$

Therefore, estimate (5.6) can be restated as

$$\log|g(w)| \leq C(V)|\nu(w) - 1|^{-\alpha\frac{d-1}{d+1}} \leq C(V)|w-1|^{-\alpha\frac{d-1}{d+1}}.$$

In the second inequality we used the mean-value theorem in conjunction with (6.11) and the fact that $\nu(1) = 1$. By [2, Thm. 0.1],

$$\sum_{g(w)=0} (1 - |w|)|w-1|^{\alpha\frac{d-1}{d+1}-1+\epsilon} \leq C(V). \tag{6.12}$$

By the Koebe distortion theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}(1 - |w|) \approx \left|\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}z}\right| \operatorname{dist}(z, \sigma(H_0)) &= \left|\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right|\left|\frac{\mathrm{d}\nu}{\mathrm{d}z}\right| \operatorname{dist}(z, \sigma(H_0)) \\ &\approx \frac{1}{|z+\mathrm{i}|^2}\operatorname{dist}(z, \sigma(H_0)).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$|w - 1| \approx |\nu - 1| \approx \frac{1}{|z + \mathrm{i}|}.$$

Since $|z + \mathrm{i}| \leq |z| + 1$, we obtain from (6.12)

$$\sum_{h(z)=0,\, z\in\mathbb{C}^+} \operatorname{dist}(z, \sigma(H_0))(1+|z|)^{-\alpha\frac{d-1}{d+1}-1-\epsilon} \leq C(V).$$

□

Theorem 6.9. *Let* $H_0 = \mathcal{D}_1$*, and let* $V \in L^d(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{(d+1)/2}$*. Then*

$$\sum_{z\in\sigma(H_0+V)} \operatorname{dist}(z, \sigma(H_0))|z^2-1|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-1+\epsilon}(1+|z|)^{-\alpha-\alpha\frac{d-1}{d+1}+1-\epsilon} \leq C(V), \tag{6.13}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$*,* $\alpha = 3$ *if* $d = 2$ *and* $\alpha > d$ *if* $d \geq 3$*.*

Proof. With the same abuse of notation as before, we write $z = z(\nu)$ and $\nu = \nu(z)$. Here,

$$z = -\frac{2\nu}{1+\nu^2}, \quad z \in \rho(H_0), \quad \nu \in \mathbb{D}. \tag{6.14}$$

The map $z \mapsto \nu(z)$ is constructed as outlined in the proof of Theorem 2.3, i.e. by composition of $\zeta \mapsto \nu = (\sqrt{\zeta} - \mathrm{i})/(\sqrt{\zeta} + \mathrm{i})$ with $z \mapsto \zeta = (z-1)/(z+1)$. Using Remark (4.2) to estimate $N(z)$ and

$$|1 - z^2| = \frac{|1+\nu|^2|1-\nu|^2}{|1+\mathrm{i}\nu|^2|1-\mathrm{i}\nu|^2}, \quad |z| \le \frac{2}{|1+\mathrm{i}\nu||1-\mathrm{i}\nu|},$$

the estimate (5.6) can be restated as

$$\begin{aligned} \log|g(w)| &\le C(V)|1-z^2|^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} + (1+|z|)^{\alpha\frac{d-1}{d+1}} \le C(V)|1-z^2|^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}(1+|z|)^{\alpha\frac{d-1}{d+1}+\alpha} \\ &\le C(V)|1-\nu|^{-\alpha}|1+\nu|^{-\alpha}|1-\mathrm{i}\nu|^{-\alpha\frac{d-1}{d+1}}|1+\mathrm{i}\nu|^{-\alpha\frac{d-1}{d+1}} \\ &\le |w-w_1|^{-\alpha}|w-w_2|^{-\alpha}|w-w_3|^{-\alpha\frac{d-1}{d+1}}|w-w_4|^{-\alpha\frac{d-1}{d+1}} \end{aligned}$$

where we have set

$$w_1 = \nu^{-1}(1), \quad w_1 = \nu^{-1}(-1), \quad w_1 = \nu^{-1}(\mathrm{i}), \quad w_1 = \nu^{-1}(1), \quad w_1 = \nu^{-1}(-\mathrm{i}).$$

By [2, Thm. 3] and due to (6.11),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{g(w)=0} &(1-|w|)|w-w_1|^{\alpha-1+\epsilon}|w-w_2|^{\alpha-1+\epsilon} \\ &\times |w-w_3|^{\alpha\frac{d-1}{d+1}-1+\epsilon}|w-w_4|^{\alpha\frac{d-1}{d+1}-1+\epsilon} \le C(V), \end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

The proof is completed using the following estimates in (6.15),

$$\begin{aligned} (1-|w|) &\approx |1-z^2|^{-\frac{1}{2}}(1+|z|)^{-1}\mathrm{dist}(z,\sigma(H_0)), \\ |w-w_1||w-w_2| &\approx |1-z^2|^{\frac{1}{2}}(1+|z|)^{-1}, \\ |w-w_3||w-w_4| &\approx (1+|z|)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

These are easy consequences of the explicit formula (6.14); for the first, one uses Koebe's distortion theorem. ☐

Theorem 6.10. *Let* $H_0 = (1-\Delta)^{1/2} - 1$*, and let* $V \in L^d(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^{(d+1)/2}$*. Then*

$$\sum_{z \in \sigma(H_0+V)} \mathrm{dist}(z,\sigma(H_0))|z|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-1+\epsilon}(1+|z|)^{-2\alpha\frac{d-1}{d+1}+\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\alpha}{2}-\epsilon} \le C(V), \tag{6.16}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$*,* $\alpha = 3$ *if* $d = 2$ *and* $\alpha > d$ *if* $d \ge 3$*.*

Proof. The (normalized) conformal map in this case with $z_0 = a < -1$ is

$$w = \psi(z) = \frac{\sqrt{z} - \sqrt{a}}{\sqrt{z} + \sqrt{a}}. \tag{6.17}$$

By (5.6), with $N(z)$ as in Wemark 4.2, we have

$$\log|g(w)| \le C(V)|1+w|^{-\alpha}|1-w|^{-2\alpha\frac{d-1}{d+1}}.$$

Using [2, Thm. 0.3], it follows that

$$\sum_{g(w)=0} (1-|w|)|1+w|^{\alpha-1+\epsilon}|1-w|^{2\alpha\frac{d-1}{d+1}-1+\epsilon} \le C(V).$$

By the Koebe's distortion theorem and equation (6.17) we have

$$\begin{aligned}(1-|w|) &\approx \frac{|a|^{1/2}}{|z|^{1/2}}\frac{\mathrm{dist}(z,[0,\infty))}{|z|+|a|},\\ |1+w| &\approx \frac{|z|^{1/2}}{(|z|+|a|)^{1/2}},\\ |1-w| &\approx \frac{|a|^{1/2}}{(|z|+|a|)^{1/2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Plugging these estimates into the previous inequality and using $|a|>1$ yields the claim (6.16). □

Remark 6.11. Theorems 6.6–6.10 improve the results of [6, 5] in a similar way that [10, Thm. 16] improves those of [3, 4]. Notice that the bounds in [6, 5] depend (somewhat implicitly) on additional properties of V, not just its L^q-norm.

Appendix A. Conclusion of the proof of Lemma 4.3

It remains to prove that (4.3) holds for all $z\in\mathbb{C}^{\pm}$. This will be a slight modification to a standard argument involving the Phragmén-Lindelöf maximum principle, see e.g. [15, Sect. 5.3].

Proof. We prove the claim for $z\in\mathbb{C}^+$ (an analogous argument gives the bound for $z\in\mathbb{C}^-$). Consider the functions

$$F(z)=\mathrm{Tr}(|V|^{1/2}\chi(D)R_0(z)V^{1/2}F),\quad z\in\mathbb{C}^+,$$

where F is a finite rank operator with canonical representation

$$F=\sum_{i=1}^N\mu_i|u_i\rangle\langle v_i|.$$

Here, $\{\mu_i\}_{i=1}^N$ are the singular numbers of K and $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^N$, $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^N$ are orthonormal systems in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We may assume that V is positive and $\widehat{V^{1/2}}\in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Indeed, since $V^{1/2}=|V|^{1/2}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\varphi}$, we have

$$\||V|^{1/2}\chi(D)R_0(z)V^{1/2}\|_{\mathfrak{S}^\alpha}\leq\||V|^{1/2}\chi(D)R_0(z)|V|^{1/2}\|_{\mathfrak{S}^\alpha}.$$

The smoothness assumption can be removed by density. By the same argument, we may assume $\widehat{u_i},\widehat{v_i}\in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We then prove the following.

i) F is analytic in $\mathbb{C}^+$ and has a continuous extension up to the boundary,
ii) $|F(\lambda)|\leq C\|V\|_{L^q}$, for $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$,
iii) For every $\epsilon>0$ there is $C_\epsilon>0$ such that $|F(z)|\leq C_\epsilon\mathrm{e}^{\epsilon|z|}$ as $|z|\to\infty$ in $\mathbb{C}^+$, uniformly in the argument of z.

Proof of i): Complete $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^N$ to an orthonormal basis $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Evaluating the trace in this basis, we see that

$$F(z)=\sum_{i=1}^N(R_0(z)V^{1/2}u_i,\overline{V^{1/2}}\chi(D)v_i). \tag{A.1}$$

This is an analytic function in $\mathbb{C}^+$ since the resolvent $R_0(z)$ is an analytic operator-valued function in this domain. From (4.5) it follows that F has a continuous extension to the boundary. Indeed, combining (A.1) and (4.5) yields

$$F(\lambda+\mathrm{i}0)=$$
$$\sum_{i=1}^N p.v.\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\frac{\chi(\xi)}{T(\xi)-\lambda}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\widehat{V^{1/2}}(\xi-\eta')\widehat{V^{1/2}}(\xi-\eta)\widehat{u_i}(\eta)\widehat{v_i}(\eta')\,\mathrm{d}\eta\,\mathrm{d}\eta'\right)\mathrm{d}\xi$$
$$-\,\mathrm{i}\pi\sum_{i=1}^N\int_{\{T(\xi)=\lambda\}}\frac{\chi(\xi)}{|\nabla T(\xi)|}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\widehat{V^{1/2}}(\xi-\eta')\widehat{V^{1/2}}(\xi-\eta)\widehat{u_i}(\eta)\widehat{v_i}(\eta')\,\mathrm{d}\eta\,\mathrm{d}\eta'\right)\mathrm{d}\sigma(\xi).$$

This is a continuous function in $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$.

Proof of ii): By Hölder's inequality in Schatten spaces [18, Thm. 2.8] and (4.9)

$$|F(\lambda)|\leq\|V^{1/2}\chi(D)R_0(\lambda)V^{1/2}\|_{\mathfrak{S}^{q(d-1)/(d-q)}}\|F\|_{\mathfrak{S}^{(d-1)/(dq-d)}}\leq C\|V\|_{L^2},$$

for $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$ and for all finite rank operators F with $\|F\|_{\mathfrak{S}^{(d-1)/(dq-d)}}=1$.

Proof of iii): A similar computation as above yields

$$|F(z)|\leq\sum_{i=1}^N\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\frac{\chi(\xi)}{|T(\xi)-z|}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\widehat{V^{1/2}}(\xi-\eta')\widehat{V^{1/2}}(\xi-\eta)\widehat{u_i}(\eta)\widehat{v_i}(\eta')\,\mathrm{d}\eta\,\mathrm{d}\eta'\right)\mathrm{d}\xi$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{|T(\xi)-z|}\leq\frac{C}{|z|},\quad |z|\gg1,\quad \xi\in\operatorname{supp}(\chi),$$

we see that $|F(z)|\leq C\mathrm{e}^{\epsilon|z|}$ for every $\epsilon>0$ when $|z|\gg1$.

By the Phragemn-Lindelöf maximum principle, i)–iii) imply that

$$|F(z)|\leq C\|V\|_{L^q},\quad z\in\mathbb{C}^+.\tag{A.2}$$

By density of the finite rank operators in $\mathfrak{S}^{(d-1)/(dq-d)}$, the inequality (4.3) follows for all $z\in\mathbb{C}^+$. $\square$

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Ari Laptev and Carlos E. Kenig for useful discussions. Support of Schweizerischer Nationalfonds, SNF, through the post-doc stipends PBBEP2_136596 and P300P2_147746 is gratefully acknowledged.

References

[1] A. A. Abramov, A. Aslanyan, and E. B. Davies. Bounds on complex eigenvalues and resonances. *J. Phys. A*, 34(1):57–72, 2001.

[2] A. Borichev, L. Golinskii, and S. Kupin. A Blaschke-type condition and its application to complex Jacobi matrices. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 41(1):117–123, 2009.

[3] M. Demuth, M. Hansmann, and G. Katriel. On the discrete spectrum of non-selfadjoint operators. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 257(9):2742–2759, 2009.

[4] M. Demuth, M. Hansmann, and G. Katriel. Eigenvalues of non-selfadjoint operators: a comparison of two approaches. In *Mathematical physics, spectral theory and stochastic analysis*, volume 232 of *Oper. Theory Adv. Appl.*, pages 107–163. Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2013.

[5] C. Dubuisson. Notes on Lieb-Thirring type inequality for a complex perturbation of fractional Schrödinger operator. *ArXiv e-prints*, March 2014.

[6] C. Dubuisson. On quantitative bounds on eigenvalues of a complex perturbation of a Dirac operator. *Integral Equations Operator Theory*, 78(2):249–269, 2014.

[7] Gregory Eskin. *Lectures on linear partial differential equations*, volume 123 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2011.

[8] R. L. Frank. Eigenvalue bounds for Schrödinger operators with complex potentials. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 43(4):745–750, 2011.

[9] R. L. Frank, . Laptev, E. H. Lieb, and R. Seiringer. Lieb-Thirring inequalities for Schrödinger operators with complex-valued potentials. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 77(3):309–316, 2006.

[10] R. L. Frank and J. Sabin. Restriction theorems for orthonormal functions, Strichartz inequalities, and uniform Sobolev estimates. *ArXiv e-prints*, April 2014.

[11] R. L. Frank and B. Simon. Eigenvalue bounds for Schrödinger operators with complex potentials. II. *ArXiv e-prints*, April 2015.

[12] I. M. Gelfand and G. E. Shilov. *Generalized functions. Vol. 1.* Academic Press [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York-London, 1964 [1977]. Properties and operations, Translated from the Russian by Eugene Saletan.

[13] C. E. Kenig, A. Ruiz, and C. D. Sogge. Uniform Sobolev inequalities and unique continuation for second order constant coefficient differential operators. *Duke Math. J.*, 55(2):329–347, 1987.

[14] A. Laptev and O. Safronov. Eigenvalue estimates for Schrödinger operators with complex potentials. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 292(1):29–54, 2009.

[15] A. Ruiz. Harmonic Analysis and inverse problems. *Lecture notes*, 2002.

[16] O. Safronov. Estimates for eigenvalues of the Schrödinger operator with a complex potential. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 42(3):452–456, 2010.

[17] D. Sambou. Lieb-Thirring type inequalities for non-self-adjoint perturbations of magnetic Schrödinger operators. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 266(8):5016–5044, 2014.

[18] B. Simon. *Trace ideals and their applications*, volume 120 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2005.

[19] E. M. Stein. *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, volume 43 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993. With the assistance of Timothy S. Murphy, Monographs in Harmonic Analysis, III.

[20] P. A. Tomas. A restriction theorem for the Fourier transform. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 81:477–478, 1975.